

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL FOX,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERNEST ZEIGLER,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00290-KES-CDB (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT

(Docs. 38, 64)

Plaintiff Michael Fox is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. This case proceeds on a claim for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment and a medical malpractice claim against defendant Ernest Zeigler. Doc. 28.

On September 7, 2021, defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. Doc. 38. After receiving an extension of time to file an opposition, plaintiff opposed the motion for summary judgment. Doc. 47. On May 2, 2023, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations for the Court to grant defendant's motion for summary judgment. Doc. 64. Specifically, the findings and recommendations found that defendant applied the arm cast on plaintiff according to Dr. Kim's orders and that plaintiff failed to establish a triable issue of fact

1 as to causation. *Id.* at 10-11. The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and
2 contained notice that any objections were to be filed within fourteen days of service. *Id.* at 11.
3 Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations, and defendant filed a response to
4 the objections. Docs. 69, 71.

5 In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court has conducted a de novo review of
6 this matter. Plaintiff generally asserts that defendant, Dr. Kim, and defense counsel have made
7 false statements and committed perjury. *See Doc. 69.* Plaintiff also references various exhibits
8 he submitted with his opposition to the motion for summary judgment to demonstrate errors in
9 the magistrate judge's factual findings. *See id.* However, the exhibits plaintiff submitted in
10 support of his opposition to summary judgment do not undermine the magistrate judge's findings
11 and recommendations and do not establish any perjury by the defense. Plaintiff argues that his
12 arm was not placed in a cast when defendant claims, but the medical records plaintiff cites
13 indicate that defendant applied the right arm cast on October 1, 2018, as found in the findings
14 and recommendations. *See Doc. 47 at 9; Doc. 64 at 10.* Plaintiff fails to raise a triable issue of
15 fact regarding causation, an element needed for his Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference
16 and state medical malpractice claims to survive.

17 After carefully reviewing the file, including plaintiff's objections, the Court finds the
18 findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 Accordingly,

- 2 1. The findings and recommendations filed on May 2, 2023, (Doc. 64), are adopted
3 in full;
- 4 2. Defendant's motion for summary judgment, (Doc. 38), is granted; and
- 5 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

6

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: October 7, 2025



9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28